UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,720	04/13/2006	Per Sjodin	09546-027US1	3242
	7590 09/27/201 ARDSON P.C. (NY)	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1022	2		COX, ALEXIS K	
MIINNEAPOLI	, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3785	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/27/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/575,720	SJODIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ALEXIS COX	3785						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on 15 June 2011. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). MENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	0031150					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	, .	ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet. 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the								
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>31, 34, 36-49, 52, 54-66</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
/J J Swann/	/A. C./							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3785	Examiner, Art Unit 3785							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's reply would overcome the following rejection if entered: the rejection of claims 31, 34, 36-49, 52, and 54-66 under 35 USC 112 as indefinite because of the word "about". This does not overcome the art rejection of record.

Regarding the submitted "Examiner Interview Summary" the examiner must emphasize that there was an informal telephone conversation, but not an interview.

The number of references applied does not, in itself, weigh against obviousness. See MPEP 201, especially form paragraph 7.37.06.